

# CERS Regulator User Group Notes and Action Items October 9, 2012

## Action Items:

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, December 11, 2012 from 8:30am-10:00am. Please e-mail any agenda item suggestions to Barbara Houghton ([barbara.houghton@edcgov.us](mailto:barbara.houghton@edcgov.us)) or Dan Firth ([daniel.firth@calepa.ca.gov](mailto:daniel.firth@calepa.ca.gov)) one week prior to next meeting.

**Enhancement 14:** Email to Barbara Houghton ([barbara.houghton@edcgov.us](mailto:barbara.houghton@edcgov.us)) no later than December 7 any suggestions you have for the any fields in the *Facility Information* submittal element that you would want highlighted as a "substantial" change between a current and previous submittal.

## Agenda for October 9, 2012:

Approved/No change

## Meeting minutes from August 14, 2012:

Approved/No change

Reminder: Decisions from this group are binding. Cal/EPA is writing CERS code based on these decisions.

## Enhancement Ranking

Enhance. No.	Status	Description	No Ranked "High" (out of 21 responses)
<a href="#">14</a>	<i>Scheduled</i>	<p><b>Regulator Submittal Review: Visual alerts for elements with "Changes" and "Substantive Changes"</b></p> <p>On Regulator Portal submittal search page, show a "Changed" or "Substantially Changed" icon on submittal elements when compared with last submittal. Clicking on the icon would show an abstract of old/new values for changed fields. On the actual form detail pages, changes between the current and last submittal could be highlighted in some fashion. A somewhat streamlined version of this feature would be implemented for the HMIS/Inventory submittal element (see Enhancement Request #25).</p> <p>Estimated completion during Q1 2013</p> <p><b>Comments 10/9/2012</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Several regulators stressed the importance of this feature—it is difficult/time-consuming to determine changes in a submittal, and many submittals will have few if any changes.</li><li>• Various suggestions for using fonts, colors, or other techniques to highlight changes.</li><li>• The method of determining changes between Inventory submissions is much more complex than between UPCF forms, and will work differently and likely improve/evolve over time.</li></ul>	14

Enhance. No.	Status	Description	No Ranked "High" (out of 21 responses)
<a href="#">32</a>	Proposed	<p><b>Owner/Operator Form: Ability to copy some/all data from one facility to one or more additional facilities.</b></p> <p>Support the ability to copy owner/operator form data from one facility to one or more additional facilities.</p> <p><u>Estimated Cal/EPA Effort Level:</u> Days to Weeks depending on scope</p> <p><b>Comments 10/9/2012</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested by several business users.</li> <li>• Chris Allen indicated that other priorities will not allow this enhancement to be implemented until after Q1 2013. The feature is less useful once businesses have done the initial entry of their Owner/Operator forms.</li> </ul>	11
<a href="#">31</a>	Proposed	<p><b>Report: Print out Portions or the Entirety of a Submittal/Element</b></p> <p>Cal/EPA implemented printable versions of all individual UPCFs by ~July 2012. Some regulators/businesses have requested the ability to print out all forms/documents in a submittal element and/or submittal. Program issues include: Is this functionality necessary, and for what specific portions of the CERS data set; what format should the output be in; is the desire for an entire submittal, or a single submittal element; do uploaded documents need to be included (and why). Technical issues include: offline processing required for large inventories and/or submittal elements with many documents; generating very large printable reports could use excessive server resources and degrade performance of other more critical CERS functions.</p> <p><u>Estimated Cal/EPA Effort Level:</u> Weeks to Months depending on scope</p> <p><b>Comments 10/9/2012</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cal/EPA indicated there are printable versions of all <i>individual</i> UPCF forms.</li> <li>• Several regulators indicated this was insufficient—a way is needed to easily/quickly export the entirety of a submittal element to reduce workload related to Public Records Act requests (minus site maps and trade secret information).</li> <li>• Question: Could CUPA's create a USER ID for public to review CERS? Cal/EPA Response: NO. The regulator portal is not designed for public use. Also, regulators should never encourage any CERS user to use a shared CERS account.</li> <li>• Further policy issues and prioritization will be directed to Jim Bohon.</li> </ul>	11

Enhance. No.	Status	Description	No Ranked "High" (out of 21 responses)
<a href="#">13</a> (Reviewed August 2012). Will be discussed by AdHoc Group	<i>Scheduled</i>	<p><b>Regulator Submittal Review: "One-click" Acceptance of Submittal Elements</b></p> <p>On the regulator portal submittal search page, add a link on each submittal element (with status "Submitted" or "Under Review") allowing authorized regulators to automatically set the submittal element's status to "Accepted" with just one click. Any other submittal status or comments would require the regulator to select the submittal element and use the "Set Submittal Status" button.</p> <p>Estimated completion during Q1 2013</p> <p><b>Comments 10/9/2012</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This feature (combined with Enhancement #14) roughly approximates the old one page certification form.</li> <li>• This feature will be implemented at the same time as Enhancement #14, as regulators will need to know if/how much a submittal element has changed before they decide perform a one-click Acceptance of a submittal.</li> <li>• This feature is less useful the first year since most facilities won't have previous submittals in CERS to be compared against.</li> <li>• If the reviewer did not perform the review of the previous submittal, should they be using one-click acceptance of a submittal—perhaps the last review was incomplete/incorrect.</li> <li>• A discussion occurred about what status to assign to "old" submittals regulators don't wish to review/accept, or "duplicate" submittals where a business submits a submittal element multiple times in a small period of time. DO NOT USE the "Not Applicable" status, which indicates the facility no longer needs to report! Instead, use the "Not Accepted" status and include notes indicating this is an administrative action because more recent submittals are available to review. Some regulators suggested addition of a new status like "Ignore" or "Superseded". Dan Firth suggested holding off until regulators have used the system more and any other status additions are accumulated. Also, statuses can't be added without affecting EDT, which will put such changes on a much more extended implementation schedule.</li> </ul>	11

Enhance. No.	Status	Description	No Ranked "High" (out of 21 responses)
<a href="#">15</a>	Proposed	<p><b>Implement various enhancements supporting the Submittal Element "Next Due Date" field.</b></p> <p>CERS2 included a new "Next Due Date" field associated with each submittal element a facility must report on. The field was added by Cal/EPA to support future features such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sending email reminders to businesses with upcoming/overdue facility reports.</li> <li>• Improving the CERS2 business portal interface to more specifically direct users toward submittal elements needing attention.</li> <li>• Reports for regulators to view upcoming/overdue facility reporting.</li> </ul> <p>Regulators can already set the "Next Due Date" field manually in two different portions of the Regulator Portal, but the data is not displayed, reportable, or used in any other way right now. Cal/EPA is seeking interest and suggestions from UPAs. Estimated Cal/EPA Effort Level: Weeks+</p> <p><b>Comments 10/9/2012</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some CUPAs stagger the due dates for Business Plan submittals, and this feature could be used to assist such efforts.</li> <li>• Various suggestions on have reminder emails include notes for what the next submittal element should include. Cal/EPA noted the due date feature is implemented per submittal element, so the facility would need to include/review all of the resources (forms, documents) in the submittal element.</li> <li>• A report would be useful shows facilities by next due date for a submittal element. Some suggestions that reminder email should go out 90 and/or 30 days in advance of the due date.</li> </ul>	10

## Enhancement 12

Firth, Daniel@EPA <Daniel.Firth@calepa.ca.gov>

Thu, Aug 23, 2012 at 11:31 AM

To: Barbara Houghton <barbara.houghton@edcgov.us>, "Huerta, Mike" <MHuerta@buttecounty.net>

Cc: Vince Mendes <VMendes@co.fresno.ca.us>

I can add a bit more: In CERS 1 we included the emergency responder features as they existed in Unidocs and the Cal/EPA technical staff augmented with a Bing Map search feature similar to Google maps. It was not included in CERS 2 initially due to the large amount of staff time necessary to rebuild it in the CERS 2 format and because we received input from an inspector in San Diego requesting the Responder feature be modified to show different information than in the CERS 1 version. Cal/EPA determined to wait to add that feature for several reasons:

1. No recognized statewide fire or emergency response entity had previously accepted or approved the CERS 1 version, AND we had almost zero response from any local agency as to its value. The Unidocs version was developed based on input from fire agencies in the Santa Clara County Fire Chiefs Association and was very specifically developed for first-in engine companies only, not hazmat responders or inspectors.
2. Because at least one agency felt the CERS 1 version should be modified Cal/EPA wants some appropriate statewide response related entity (State Fire Marshal, CalChiefs, etc) to be involved in any future design/feature. I understand that the CFB Emergency Response TAG has been working on this at some level but am not sure where they are.
3. Any CUPA can give any fire or emergency response agency person access to CERS as a 'viewer' to view all data in CERS.
4. Cal/EPA has been exchanging CERS data with ePlan, a free emergency response website available to any fire agency in California.
5. Information in CERS can also be delivered via EDT to software providers to Fire and Response agencies such as Fire RMS or Fire House. These software vendors would likely be able to customize their software to meet varying needs of their clients. Further, agencies with local web portals may provide their own emergency responder features.
6. There is a sizable up front staff investment to build the features in CERS 2 plus there would be an ongoing investment of staff resources to maintain and update going forward. Cal/EPA is not sure that they have the resources or whether they should use limited resources given the other needs of CERS and the options that might work better for responders in the long run.

The third option implies that emergency response agencies check into ePlan to see if it would meet their needs. The fourth option would require some kind of agreement specifying what data would be available, for whom, limitations and methods of data transfer.

Once the CRUG and CBUG weigh in on this particular option, their recommendations plus the above will be included in the discussions at the Change Management Group and or the Data Steering Committee (the latter as it pertains to policy decisions). Cal/EPA would make the final decision based on all of the recommendations and the available resources.

Hope that helps.

Dan

### ENHANCEMENT 12 – COMMENTS

- First Responders can be added as viewers of the UPA to the existing CERS systems.
- Many comments that the existing system is too detailed/complex for emergency responder use.
- First Responders only need inventory, site map(s), contacts?
- Lack of agreement among regulators and first responders about what really is needed/wanted.
- Cal/EPA will not act as a 24x7 source of data to emergency responders under the current resourcing model for CERS.
- Regulators could collect data from CERS or their local data systems and disseminate to emergency responders.
- ZIP file feature in UNIDOCs/CERS1 delivered a local, static copy of key ER data. Was rarely used, and some regulators wanted new/different features, so Cal/EPA did not proceed with development. Comment also that it was not searchable.

Barbara Houghton will get the results from the 21 UPAs provided [CERS Enhancement Listing](#) prioritizations, and in the future we will cover those enhancements in our upcoming meetings.

Questions can be directed to Barbara Houghton ([barbara.houghton@edcgov.us](mailto:barbara.houghton@edcgov.us)). Or Dan Firth ([dfirth@calepa.ca.gov](mailto:dfirth@calepa.ca.gov)).

## Wrap Up/Adjournment

- Next meeting to be December 11th from 8:30 am to 10:00 am.
- Meeting was adjourned at around 9:30 am
- A questions and answer session occurred from 9:30 to 10:10am.

## Q & A with Dan Firth & Chris Allen

### 1. What is the state of seeding?

Chris Allen indicated a large number of seeding files had been received and processed. Links to documents showing the seeding schedule and which CUPAs have completed seeding are available at the CERS Central Data Seeding site (<http://cers.calepa.ca.gov/DataSeeding>).

### 2. Public Records Request

A lengthy discussion occurred about the need for dealing with Public Records Requests, especially related to the earlier discussion for Enhancement 31 about printing out the full content of a submittal element. Dan Firth indicated regulators will need to continue to handle public records at the local agency level as they have done for the past years. CAL/EPA has a longer term goal to develop a public records. If regulators feel this is a critical issue, they should push their concerns to the CUPA Forum Board.